



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

AW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,282	09/22/2000	Leonid Alexeevich Polyakov	U 012959-5	1196

7590 11/17/2003

Ladas & Parry  
26 West 61st Street  
New York, NY 10023

EXAMINER

GILL, ERIN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2881

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/667,282

Applicant(s)

POLYAKOV ET AL.

Examiner

Erin-Michael Gill

Art Unit

2881

AW

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/28/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. No reference was made to a specific claim and no traversal was made of any of the claim rejections in the submitted arguments. The submitted amendments did not change the scope of the claims. Each of applicants arguments are addressed below.
2. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).
3. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).
4. In this case, the cited reference of Trajmir teaches the separation of isotopes, as was stated in the previous Office Action. The recitation of "isotopes" in the prior Office Action was not limited to a particular element. Column 4 lines 27-28 of the cited patent to Trajmir

Art Unit: 2881

specifically teaches that isotopes other than the those from the exemplary elements described may too be used in the apparatus. The reference of Sasao teaches the claimed creation of palladium isotopes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to produce isotopes with the apparatus of Sasao and collimate and separate them with the apparatus of Trajmir since to those desiring the creation, collimation and separation of Palladium isotopes, Sasao teaches a conventional creation of Palladium isotopes and Trajmir, which does not limit from where the created isotopes may come, teaches the claimed collimation and separation of those isotopes and the combination of which would have been within the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art.

5. In response to all of applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

6. In response to paragraph 3 on page 4, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 on page 5, and all of page 6 and 7 of applicant's arguments, applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

7. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., paragraph 1 on page 5, "separate simultaneously all the palladium isotopes") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

8. For the aforementioned reasons, the rejections of the previous Office Action are repeated below and made final.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

10. Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasao et al. US Patent No. 5110562 (hereafter Sasao) in view of Trajmar, Sandor US Patent No. 4,704,197 (hereafter Trajmar). Regarding claims 1-6, Sasao, col. 6 lines 45-49, teaches the creation of a Palladium vapor from a Palladium crucible. However, Sasao fails to teach the ions being formed into a beam using electrodes of an ion optical system according to isotopes with a magnetic field. Trajmar, col 3 lines 15-22 and figs 5-6, overcomes this limitation by teaching the separation and collimation of isotopes using a magnetic field. The collection means of a receiving box is inherent to the apparatus. Official Notice taken. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the apparatus of Trajmar with the invention of Sasao since such a combination would lead to a better collimation and separation of Palladium isotopes.

11. Regarding the limitation that the crucible is heated to a range of 1580-1700° C, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to heat the Palladium to those temperatures since it has been held that where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In Re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

12. Regarding claim 7, it is inherent to the process of Sasao that reaction products are not formed in the process, and as such, they are assumed not to be present.

***Conclusion***

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erin-Michael Gill whose telephone number is 703-305-7858. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00 EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Lee can be reached on 703-308-4116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



EMG



JOHN R. LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800